

LITERARY MISCELLANY.

For the National Era.

THE GRINDING HEEL.—No. 2.

"Have pity on them, for their life
Is full of grief and sorrow;
You do not know one-half the woes
The very poor must bear;
You do not see the silent tears
By many a mother shed
As childhood offers up the prayer,
'Give us our daily bread.'"

Caroline Douglas was born in Jamaica, in the sunny days of its prosperity. Her father was a native of Scotland. Soon after his marriage, he bade farewell to the home of his childhood, that he might increase his fortune by a residence in the West Indies. He purchased a large plantation, and was successful in his pursuit of wealth. Caroline was nurtured in the lap of luxury. Her every wish was gratified. She was the delight of her parents. As she could not be educated on the island as they desired, she was early sent to England, and there, in the best schools, was thoroughly taught, and her mind well disciplined. In addition to her English education, she obtained such a knowledge of French as enabled her to write and speak it with as much ease as her mother tongue. Her taste for music was cultivated, and she became a fine player on the piano and the harp. She was also skillful with her pen.

Upon leaving school, Caroline returned to Jamaica, and not many years afterward married George McDonald, a young Scotchman in the employment of Government. His income was large. Consequently, Caroline was abundantly able to gratify her literary taste, and to relieve herself entirely of the cares of house-keeping. One and another precious immortal was entrusted to her keeping, till her little family numbered three daughters and two sons. She realized more than most mothers the importance of her charge. Though she employed nurses, she did not intrust her children entirely to them, but felt that it was both her duty and her privilege to watch over them. As they grew older, she was their teacher. Her time and thoughts were devoted to their welfare.

For several years the sun of prosperity shone cheerily on her pathway, but at length clouds dimmed its brightness. Her husband's income was gradually reduced, till finally the mere necessities of life were all that he could procure. Paintings, and books, and most of the treasures of former days, were exchanged for food and clothing.

Caroline felt that her cup of sorrow was full. The island was ruined, and her husband and father were not exempted from its fate. But a still deeper sorrow was in store for her. Her beloved husband, overwhelmed by these successive misfortunes, sank upon a bed of sickness. With what agony she watched by that bedside, and oh! what utter desolation filled her heart when he breathed his last! For weeks she yielded to the bitterness of her grief, and refused to be comforted. She became so weak that her friends despaired of her life.

The thought that she was rebelling against God so impressed her, that she resolved to yield no more to that hopeless despondency, but to exert herself for the support of her family. I will not tell you of the various attempts she made to do so, and of her want of success.

Friends advised her to remove to the United States. She collected the fragments of her husband's estate, and with a few hundred dollars came to New York. Here my acquaintance with her commenced. She was lady-like, cultivated, and agreeable. Sorrow had indeed made its impress on her face, but she was on that account no less attractive and pleasing.

Mrs. McDonald contrived to open a school in New York. How I wished I could direct her to some place in the country, where she could be known and appreciated. There is no loneliness like the loneliness of a great city, and nowhere is it more difficult for a stranger to gather a school sufficiently large to make it profitable than there. Surrounded, perhaps, by those who need just such a school, and who, if they knew you, would bestow upon you their patronage, as much for their own sake as yours, you are yet almost unfriended and unknown. Solitude in the desert must be akin to this. In the green country, you can scarce be alone. The green fields, the flowing river, the hills, the mountains, the trees, the shrubs, the tiny flowers, are all companions for you. They cheer your drooping spirits, and speak to you a "various language." Country people are not so shut out as city people from all knowledge of their neighbors, and all sympathy with them. No desolate widow, competent to teach, can go into a country village, open a school, without meeting kindness, and in ordinary circumstances, with success.

Mrs. McDonald took a house in New York, and from her small funds furnished it. She opened a school, and it increased till she had fifteen little girls committed to her charge. Just as the bud of hope was expanding, there came "a frost, a chilling frost." Mrs. McDonald was taken ill, and for three months was unable to do anything. Her little school was scattered. She had scarcely recommenced teaching, when typhoid fever came into her family: Laura, Jane, and Ella, successively dropped under this fearful disease. Many times a day the physician visited them, and for weeks they lingered on the very borders of the grave.

When I last saw Mrs. McDonald, she was yet ministering to the wants of her invalid children. She had employed a teacher, to keep up her fragments of a school. She had reserved money enough to pay her quarter's rent, and was living by taking a few boarders. What she should do after May, she could not even conjecture. She was almost in despair. She could not rent a house, for she had no money, and no one would be surety for her. My heart ached for her. I had known enough of want to be able to sympathize with her, and I was too poor to relieve her. All I could do was to pity her, and to promise to write to a friend in her behalf.

"Fare, save the poor, feed the poor." The rich cannot understand their need, and, oftentimes, their utter helplessness. They say, none need starve in America, and yet I have known an American-born woman starve to death, even in New York.

No class needs more sympathy than that which Mrs. McDonald represents. She has not been trained to grapple with want; her tastes, her education, her manners, fit her for a place in refined and cultivated society. Where will stern poverty place her?

The grinding heel is upon her, pressing her to the earth, crushing every hope, and cruelly, lazarizing her spirit. Every fibre of her being feels its rasping torture; she struggles to resist its power and remove its fearful weight. Will her name be added to the list of the victims, or will some friendly hand extend the aid that shall save her? "Inasmuch as ye have done it to one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me."

ANN HOFF.

Mrs. A. West has recovered \$35 damages of a liquor seller named Henry Martin, under the Indiana law, at Brookville, for selling her husband liquor so as to intoxicate.

The Cleveland Lyceum has resoundingly invited to John Mitchell, to lecture before them, on account of the views avowed by his paper, the *Citizen*, on the Slavery question.

An attempt has again been made, in the Senate of Rhode Island, to restore capital punishment, not because there are any more murders there than formerly, but some people like the idea of a gallows. The attempt failed.

PROSPECTUS OF THE DAILY NATIONAL ERA.

I shall issue, on the 2d day of January ensuing, the DAILY NATIONAL ERA, a Political and Literary Newspaper.

In *Politics*, it will advocate the Rights of Man, and the Equality of Rights, and oppose whatever violates or tends to violate them, whether this be Involuntary Personal Servitude, Civil Despotism, Spiritual Absolutism, Class Legislation, the Selfishness of Capital, the Tyranny of Combination, the Oppression of a Majority, or the Exactions of a Party.

It will hold no fellowship with the Whig and Democratic organizations, believing that the main issues on which they have been arrayed against each other are obsolete or settled, and that they are now chiefly used by the Sectional Interest of Slavery, to impair the love of Liberty natural to the American mind, and to subjugate the American People to its rule. Disclaiming all connection with them, it will sympathize with those of their adherents who are honestly seeking through them to advance the substantial interests of the country, although it must believe that they have not chosen the better way.

It will be a supporter of the Independent Democracy, which holds that the Truths of the Declaration of Independence are *practical*; that in their light the Constitution of the United States is to be interpreted; that to them the laws should be conformed—a Party, whose motto is, *Union, not for the sake of Union, but for the sake of Freedom and Progress; and Law, not for the sake of Law, but for the Protection of Human Rights and Interests*—the only sure foundation of order and concord.

In no sense will it be the organ of a Party, or a mere Party Paper, but absolutely "free and independent," claiming to speak "by authority" for nobody except its editor, and recognizing no authority in any quarter to prescribe its course and policy.

In *Literature*, it will aim to unite the Beautiful with the True, and to make both immediately subservient to the practical purposes of every-day life.

Able correspondents, at home and abroad, have been secured, and ample provision has been made for its Literary Miscellany.

It will publish condensed reports of the proceedings of Congress, explain movements in the country, the causes of which do not always lie upon the surface, and from its position be able to keep a constant watch upon the action of the Federal Government in relation to all questions at issue between Liberty and Slavery.

The extensive subscription of the *Weekly Era*, which, during the year about to close, has reached the number of twenty-eight thousand, must make it an eligible medium for advertisers.

The *Daily Era* will be issued on a sheet as large as that of the *Daily National Intelligencer*, on the 2d day of January, 1854, and daily thereafter, until the 1st of September, 1854, (or longer, should Congress continue in session), at FIVE DOLLARS FOR THREE MONTHS; and should the session then adjourn, the publication will be resumed on the 1st of December following, by the year.

As but sixteen days intervene between this and the 2d of January, it is important that subscriptions be forwarded at once.

Payment in advance will be invariably required.

G. BAILEY.

Washington, December 15, 1853.

PROSPECTUS OF THE EIGHTH VOLUME OF THE NATIONAL ERA.

G. BAILEY, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

JOHN G. WHITTIER, CORRESPONDING EDITOR.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

The *National Era* is a weekly newspaper, devoted to Liberty and Political Economy. It is the only paper of its kind in the country, and it is the only paper that it is time to unite the Beautiful with the True, and to make both immediately subservient to the practical purposes of every-day life.

In *Politics*, it advocates the Rights of Man, and the Equality of Rights, and opposes whatever violates or tends to violate them, whether this be Involuntary Personal Servitude, Civil Despotism, Spiritual Absolutism, Class Legislation, the Selfishness of Capital, the Tyranny of Combination, the Oppression of a Majority, or the Exactions of a Party.

It holds no fellowship with the Whig and Democratic organizations, believing that the main issues on which they have been arrayed against each other are obsolete or settled, and that they are now chiefly used by the Sectional Interest of Slavery, to impair the love of Liberty natural to the American mind, and to subjugate the American People to its rule. Disclaiming all connection with them, it will sympathize with those of their adherents who are honestly seeking through them to advance the substantial interests of the country, although it must believe that they have not chosen the better way.

It is a supporter of the Independent Democracy, which holds that the Truths of the Declaration of Independence are *practical*; that in their light the Constitution of the United States is to be interpreted; that to them the laws and institutions of the country should be conformed—a Party, whose motto is, *Union, not for the sake of Union, but for the sake of Freedom and Progress; and Law, not for the sake of Law, but for the Protection of Human Rights and Interests*—the only sure foundation of order and concord.

In no sense is it the organ of a Party, or a mere Party Paper, but absolutely "free and independent," claiming to speak "by authority" for nobody except its editor, and recognizing no authority in any quarter to prescribe its course and policy.

The Eighth Volume of the *Era* will commence on the first of January ensuing, and be enlarged by the addition of four columns. We have neglected no means that could promise to make it an agreeable companion for the Household, and an efficient coadjutor to the enlightened Politician. It has secured able correspondents at home and abroad, and no journal in the country can surpass the *Era* in its respect to its Literary Department.

The *Era* publishes condensed reports of the proceedings of Congress, explains movements in that body, the causes of which do not always lie upon the surface, and from its position is enabled to keep a constant watch upon the action of the Federal Government in relation to all questions at issue between Liberty and Slavery.

The only journal at the seat of the Federal Government representing the Anti-Slavery Sentiment of the Republic, while the Pro-Slavery Sentiment is represented here by four daily papers, nearly all of them being liberally sustained by Governmental patronage, it asks the support of all who believe, in sincerity, that the Union was formed to secure the blessings of Liberty, and not to perpetuate the curse of Slavery.

Payment in advance is invariably required. To prevent annoyance and loss to ourselves and readers to preserve their files unbroken, and to enable us to know how large an edition of the paper to issue, all subscriptions should be renewed before they expire. We have no credit-subscribers on our books.

TERMS.

Single copy	52
Three copies	5
Five copies	5
Ten copies	18
Single copy six months	1
Ten copies six months	1

These are the terms for both old and new subscribers, forwarding their own subscriptions.

AGENTS.

Agents are entitled to fifty cents on each new yearly subscriber, and twenty-five cents on each renewed subscriber—except in the case of clubs.

A club of three subscribers, one of whom may be an old one, at \$5, will entitle the person making it up to a copy of the *Era* for three months; a club of five, two of whom may be old ones, at \$8, to a copy for six months; a club of ten, five of whom may be old ones, at \$15, to a copy for one year.

When a club of subscribers has been forwarded, additions may be made to it, on the same terms.

Money to be forwarded by mail at our risk. Large amounts may be remitted in drafts or certificates of deposit. When money is sent, notes on the Banks of Boston, New York, Philadelphia, or Baltimore, are preferred. New England notes are at less discount than New York State notes, and those less than Western notes.

P. S. Newspapers friendly to our enterprise will please notice or publish our Prospectus, as they may see proper.

The *Daily Era* can be had every morning at the Periodical Stand of Mr. J. T. BATES, Exchange, Philadelphia; also, the *Weekly Era*.

Mr. JAMES ELLIOTT is authorized to receive and receipt for subscriptions and advertisements for the *Daily* and the *Weekly National Era*, in Cincinnati and vicinity.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1854.

In our advertising columns will be found a very generous offer from Wm. Birney, editor of the *Philadelphia Daily Register*, to Reading-Room Associations.

THE ISSUE—THE SUBJECT CONTINUED.

We must not forget the position of the Independent Democracy, assailed by the *Washington Sentinel*, viz: that by the original policy of the fathers of the Republic, "Slavery was restricted within State limits, and Freedom was to be secured to every person outside of State limits, and under the exclusive jurisdiction of the General Government." The first argument against this position, urged by that paper, that the slave trade was sanctioned, continued, and protected, by the fathers of the Republic, and therefore their original policy could not have been as stated in the Address, we disposed of yesterday.

The assertion made by the *Sentinel*, in connection with this argument—that slaves on the high seas in American vessels are held "as chattels, solely and exclusively by virtue of the exclusive jurisdiction of the General Government"—as we showed, involved not only the affirmation of a Principle, fundamental in the creed of Independent Democracy, but the repudiation of the policy of Non-Intervention, as advocated by that journal.

Proceeding, then, to examine whether it was true or false, we showed that there was no provision in the Constitution of the United States, in virtue of which slaves on board American vessels on the high seas could be continued as such.

At this point we resume the argument. We admit that there is a law of Congress, assuming jurisdiction over the transportation of slaves coastwise, and recognizing them as slaves on their passage from one port to another in the United States. It is part and parcel of the act passed by Congress in 1807, for the abolition of the foreign slave trade, and the object of it was to prevent the coastwise trade in slaves which might be brought from Cuba, or Africa, or other foreign countries, in evasion of the act. It was not intended to encourage, or sanction, or protect the coastwise trade in slaves; the framers of the act were intent upon another object, seeking indeed in good faith to carry out the original policy of the fathers of the Republic. So exclusively was their attention directed to this end, that they overlooked the implied sanction contained in the terms of the act to the transportation of slaves coastwise. The sections containing this implication, but designed to prevent infraction or invasion of the prohibition against the importation of slaves, provided that slaves should not be transported coastwise from one port to another in the United States, in vessels under forty tons burden, that all slaves thus transported should be described particularly in the manifests, and that the shipper should swear that they were not imported into the United States after January 1, 1808.

The existence of these provisions proves nothing against the position, taken in the Address in respect to the "original policy of the fathers of the Republic," because the great object of the law of which they are a part, was to carry out the original policy of Slavery restriction, and because their real intent was simply to prevent the fraudulent evasion of the Law; but, if this be denied, and if we admit, for the sake of the argument, that their intent as well as effect was to protect and encourage Slavery outside of State limits and within the exclusive jurisdiction of the General Government, then they prove a departure from that "original policy," and not its non-existence.

Apart from the bearings of these provisions on the general argument, do they sustain the assumption of the *Sentinel*, that slaves are held as such in American vessels on the high seas, in virtue of the exclusive jurisdiction of the General Government? If they do, they are unconstitutional, and incompatible with the policy and the doctrine of non-intervention. Where is power conferred in the Constitution, on Congress, to make or hold a slave? It can no more make a slave than a king, as was well said by a Democratic member of Congress. Not only is no power conferred to make or continue Slavery, but the General Government is positively restricted from depriving any person of life, liberty, or the pursuit of happiness, without due process of law.

If the provisions of the act of 1807, then, are designed to continue the status of Slavery on the high seas, from the moment the slaves, shipped at an American port, pass beyond State jurisdiction, they are clearly unconstitutional, and therefore null and void.

That they are incompatible under every aspect with the doctrine of Non-Intervention, scarcely needs an argument. If their design be as just stated, or if, in the language of the *Sentinel*, they sanction and protect Slavery on the high seas, they constitute a clear case of flagrant intervention with Slavery by the

General Government, which the *Sentinel*, if true to its own creed, must unite with us in denouncing.

The truth is, legal Slavery—we use the phrase as generally understood in all sections of our country—never exists under the American flag, on the high seas, outside of the jurisdiction of a State. The slave code of the State stops at "State limits," has no extra-territorial force. To claim that the law of Virginia or Kentucky can stamp upon a man the ineffaceable character of a slave, is to claim that it is a *once universal and supreme*. The *Sentinel* does well to reject the absurdity that slaves, under the American flag on the high seas, are held or continued as slaves by State law. And there is no Federal Law, ordaining or continuing Slavery in such circumstances. How would it look?

Whereas the transportation of slaves under the American flag, coastwise, is a great convenience to the Planters and Slave traders; and whereas the State Laws under which slaves are held have no binding force beyond State limits, and slaves shipped at any port within a State, cannot be held as such, on the high seas, which are beyond State jurisdiction—

Therefore, Be it enacted by the United States in Congress assembled, that Slavery be, and hereby is, legalized, in all American vessels, on the ocean, beyond State jurisdiction, and no person, shipped as a slave at any port within the United States, shall be released from bondage, on passing out of State jurisdiction into Federal, but shall be continued therein, by virtue of said Federal Jurisdiction.

This is putting the case in a light which the masses can understand. They know that no such law exists—that no such law could be enacted—that there is no provision in the Constitution which could be tortured into a warrant for such a law.

The truth is, the coastwise slave trade is illegal and piratical. Every slave shipped at a Southern port, the moment he passes out on the ocean beyond State jurisdiction, is free; the American flag that covers him then covers a freeman; the captain who conveys him to another port, to be sold, is guilty of transporting a free man to Slavery; and he who buys him buys a free man.

We pass from this incidental point, to the second consideration urged by the *Sentinel*, against the position under discussion:

"Again, in the national Territories, over which the General Government exercises exclusive jurisdiction, Slavery has always existed among the Indians, admitted and protected by the national exclusive jurisdiction." If the National Government had no right to interfere with Indian law to secure freedom to every one outside State limits; interfering with the Indian law, then Slavery was a municipal law of the Indians, entitled to respect as any other municipal law, and of course admitting re-organizing, and protecting Slavery. Thus the policy of the fathers of the Republic! gave continuance to Slavery co-extensive with Indian population?

We shall not undertake to contest the assertions as to the existence of Slavery among the Indians, from the time of the organization of the Government. To what extent it is true, and with what limitations it should be received, we presume the *Sentinel* knows no more than we do, and that we must confess, is very little. The answer to it, considered as an argument against the position of the address, is obvious and conclusive. Slavery has existed among the Indians, either as incorporated under the Government of a State, with the citizens thereof, or as distinct, independent communities; in neither case, there fore, within the exclusive jurisdiction of the General Government.

But enough of this subject for to-day; to-morrow we may resume it.

THE STATE OF THE QUESTION.

The chances of the passage of the Nebraska Bill in its present shape become more and more doubtful. The speech of Gen. Houston against it, in which he stood up manfully for the Missouri Compromise, condemned without qualification the attempt to repeal or set it aside, and committed himself decidedly against every movement hostile to it, has inspired the advocates of good faith. Representing an extreme Southern State, how honorably his position contrasts with that of the New Hampshire politician, who occupies the White House! We have often said that if we are obliged to choose for the Presidency between an honorable, high-minded Southern man, and a Northern man, dominated by Slavery, by all odds, give us the former.

In the Senate, yesterday, the question being taken on the amendment proposed by Mr. Douglas, to strike out from the 14th section of the bill the following words—

"That the Constitution and all laws of the United States which are not locally inapplicable shall have the same force and effect within the said Territory of Nebraska as elsewhere within the United States, except the 8th section of the act preparatory to the admission of Missouri into the Union, approved March 6, 1820, which was superseded by the principles of the legislation of 1850, commonly called the 'Compromise Measures,' and is hereby declared inoperative."

And insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Which being inconsistent with the principle of non-intervention by Congress with Slavery in the States and Territories, as recognized by the legislation of 1850, commonly called the 'Compromise Measures,' is hereby declared inoperative and void; it being the true intent and meaning of this act not to legislate Slavery into any Territory or State, nor to exclude it therefrom, but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States."

It was carried by the following vote—

YEAS—Messrs. Adams, Abbotson, Bayard, Bell, Benjamin, Brodhead, Brown, Butler, Cass, Clayton, Dawson, Dixon, Dodge of Iowa, Douglas, Evans, Fitzpatrick, Geyer, Gwin, Hunter, Johnson, Jones of Iowa, Jones of Tennessee, Mason, Morton, Norris, Pearce, Pettit, Pratt, Sebastian, Sells, Stuart, Thompson of Kentucky, Toombs, Waller, Williams—35.

NAYS—Messrs. Allen, Chase, Dodge of Wisconsin, Everett, Fish, Fox, Houston, Seward, Sumner, Wade—10.

The amendment differs in no respect from the clause stricken out, except in substituting the words, "inconsistent with," for "superseded by." The action now declares this untruth—the Compromise of 1850, which was confined to the Territory of Louisiana, "is inconsistent with the principle of the legislation of 1850," which was confined to the territories

acquired from Mexico. The Senate might just as truthfully declare that the Ordinance of 1787, for the government of the Northwest Territory, was "inconsistent with" the act of 1812, for the formation of a Territorial Government in Missouri. Then, a right was asserted in one case, which was not asserted or exercised in the other; and in 1820, a right was asserted, which was waived in 1850. But, because Congress in one act may assert a right, which, for reasons satisfactory to itself, it waives in another act, it does not follow that the acts are inconsistent with each other.

Not a Southern Whig voted against the amendment, and General Houston was the only Southern Democrat. Northern Whigs will please take notice that Senators Clayton and Bell, from whom they have been expecting better things, voted for it! Let them go.

The hollowness of the plea in behalf of the principle of self-government, set up by the advocates of the Bill, which we took special pains to expose about a week since, is we are glad to see, about to be brought to the test. In the Senate, yesterday, they were unexpectedly disturbed by the following amendment submitted by Mr. Chase to the same session:

"Under which the people of the Territories, through their appropriate representatives, may, if they see fit, prohibit Slavery therein."

Whereupon a protracted discussion arose, which was terminated by an adjournment. We shall see how many of these advocates of "self-government" will vote that the People of a Territory have a right to exclude Slavery. The Bill itself, in proposing a form of Government for the Territory, providing for the distribution of its various powers, and the appointment of Executive officers by the President, gives the lie to their professions. To be consistent, they should abandon it, and introduce a simple resolution, recognising the right of the People in the Territory to organize their own Government, determine its powers, and elect all their own officers.

The prospect now is, that the discussion on the Bill will be protracted in the Senate, far beyond the intention of its authors. Its opponents are prepared for a vigorous resistance, and its friends will be compelled to define positions and guard against "the fire in the rear."

In the House, the debate has been opened, although the particular subject under consideration was the Homestead Bill. Mr. Maco, a Democratic member from Indiana, led off in a strong speech against the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, and was followed by Mr. Skelton, a Democratic member from New Jersey, on the same side. Both are what are called Old Line Democrats.

Mr. Meacham, a Whig member from Vermont, speaking against the same measure, Mr. Richardson, of Illinois, a supporter of the Douglas bill, undertook to gag him. The Chair stated that the usage had been to allow members in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union to speak upon topics not immediately connected with that under consideration; but the rules of the House were against the usage, and he must decide in accordance with the rules. The promissory with which the Committee overruled the decision, thereby allowing Mr. Meacham to proceed, shows that discussion on the Nebraska Question cannot be prevented. The spirited speech of Mr. Fenton, (a "Soft" from New York), in the House yesterday, is another favorable indication. He denied the right of Ex-Governor Smith, of Virginia, to prescribe a test for the Democracy, and told him, that if the Nebraska bill was to be that test, he would find "Softs" springing up all over the North.

But, let no one be deceived. Were the vote to be taken to-day, we should read the result. The free States have 144 members of the present House, the slave States, 85—majority of the former, 59. The Representatives of the slave States will probably be united in support of Repeal, and all they have to do is to secure thirty votes from the North and West. These and more are calculated upon by the advocates of Repeal. An Administration, wielding the power of Slavery, and backed by such men as Cass and Douglas, that could not command thirty Northern and Western votes for a measure, designed now to be its leading measure, would be set down as very imbecile or unreliable.

Let the People therefore be admonished that there is danger, imminent danger, such only as they by prompt and stern demonstrations all over the North and West can dissipate.

AMENDMENT TO THE POST OFFICE LAWS.

The amendment to the Post Office Laws, reported by Mr. Olds in the House on the 24th of January, has been understood by some as going back to the old mode of charging by the piece, instead of by weight. This is a mistake. The phrases, "single letter," and "double letter," are used, but it is expressly provided that "every letter or parcel, not exceeding half an ounce, shall be deemed a single letter; and every additional weight of half an ounce, or less, shall be charged with an additional single postage."

The special object of the amendment is, to make the rule of pre-payment uniform, in all cases, at the three-cent rate. We go for this. Exact pre-payment in all cases, and you relieve the mail of dead letters, reduce the labors and simplify the accounts of postmasters.

INTERNATIONAL COPYRIGHT.

We have received a copy of a circular protest against the ratification of a Treaty respecting an International Copyright, supposed to be under consideration in the Senate. It is urged with force that the Treaty-making power ought not to be extended at the expense of the Legislative. The manufacture of books, it is said, is a business involving millions of dollars, employing the labor and affording sustenance to thousands of our fellow-citizens, and it should no more be endangered by this secret, irresponsible action of the Government, than any other important industrial pursuit of the country. Whatever may be thought of the rights of authors, this subject of an International Copyright belongs properly to Congress. It should be examined and determined by that body, under its responsibilities to the People. We want no legislation by one branch of Congress, and that, from its very composition, as well as from its iron rule of secrecy, almost irresponsible to public opinion.

CONGRESS.

In the Senate, to-day, Mr. Badger, of North Carolina, whose liberal sentiments and sound views have heretofore entitled him to much commendation in the free States, gave his support to the Nebraska iniquity in a speech of extraordinarily ultra pro-Slavery sentiment. This speech will be read with astonishment by the many who have hitherto known him, and who have confided, as we have, in the integrity of his purposes, and the disinterestedness of his efforts.

In the House, nothing definite has been consummated. The presentation of Mr. Boyce's views on the Tariff is the first demonstration on that subject, thus far; but we shall hear much upon it anon.

HON. J. M. BUTTS.

We have read, with pleasure, the able, frank, and manly letter of this gentleman. His words should be words of warning to the South. He plainly shows the certain future defeat that present victory must necessarily bring to that region of the Republic.

HON. PERRY E. BROCHUS.—Our readers have been informed that this gentleman has been appointed by the President, and confirmed by the Senate, as U. States District Judge for the district of New Mexico; and it will no doubt gratify many to know that the vote in the Senate was unanimous in favor of his appointment.

Mr. Brochus was sent to Utah in this same capacity by the Administration of Mr. Fillmore; but, unwilling to trail the ermine of his office in the dust to gratify the base desires and flatter the criminal practices of that people, he was compelled to retire from before their undisguised hatred and opposition, and to return to this capital. For this conduct toward him and his associate, the Mormons, so far from being rebuked, were flattered by the appointment of a Judge from their own number, and another gentleman who has proved acceptable to them; while Judge Brochus and his associate have ever since rested apparently under the displeasure of our Government. We are pleased that the present action removes this presumption, and does justice to an officer whose only fault, so far as we have ever been informed, has consisted in the exhibition of commendable firmness in the performance of the duties of his position.

Old Mr. Riston, the keeper of a small grocery on the island, who was struck on the head with an axe, by an unknown Irishman, while protecting his daughter from the rude assaults of the Irishman, one evening last week, died last night from the injury. The murderer has not yet been captured.

Uniform weights, measures, and currency, the world over—these are the need of the age.

It appears that but six Senators voted to confirm the nomination of Mr. Saunders as Consul to Liverpool.

THE MEXICAN TREATY.

This document comes to us through the Northern papers. The *New York Evening Post* of last evening says:

"Two of the morning papers contain a copy of the Mexican treaty negotiated by Colonel Gadsden, together with the message of the President, proposing certain amendments to the contract between the two nations. These documents, it appears, were communicated confidentially to the Senate, but either one of the members has not considered himself bound by the injunction of privacy, or his pocket has been picked.

It will be seen that the treaty, as negotiated, did not contain the stipulations which some ascribe to it, that the Government of the United States, in proposing certain amendments to the claims of its citizens against the Mexican Republic, amounting, since the treaty of Guadalupe, to the sum of five millions of dollars. On the contrary, the treaty obliges the Government to pay all the claims of that description to their fullest extent, as far as they may be substantiated. The alteration recommended by the President makes no change in this respect. It merely omits the mention